HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GOPALA KRISHNA TAMADA

W.P.No.34783 of 1997

Dated 23th Day of February, 2007

Between:

Nadimpalli Annapurnamma .. Petitioner

And

The Commissioner,
Survey Settlements & Land Records,
A.P., Hyderabad
and five others ..
Respondents

O R D E R:

This writ petition is filed to quash the order, dated 15.10.1997 passed by the 1st respondent.

The brief facts of the case are the Muttadar of Yerragonda, East Godavari District granted dry land of an extent of Hec.1.62 Acres in S.No.21, situated at Godugurai village, East Godavari District to the petitioner in the year 1368 Fasli on lease, which continued up to 1382 Fasli (1958 to 1973). After the abolition of the Mutta, the petitioner claimed ryotwari patta in respect of the land in question before the 3rd respondent-Settlement Officer, Peddapuram, who granted ryotwari patta by his order dated 28.8.1974 and since then the petitioner has been in possession and enjoyment of it. Against this order, the 4th respondent filed an appeal before the 2nd respondent-District Collector, who allowed it on 25.3.1995. Aggrieved by the order of the District Collector, the petitioner filed Second Appeal before the 1st respondent-Commissioner of Settlements, who, by his order, dated 15.10.1997, dismissed it confirming the order of the 2nd respondent. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has filed this writ petition.

Heard the learned counsel for both the parties.

Admittedly, the 3rd respondent-Settlement Officer after holding an enquiry granted ryotwari patta in favour of the petitioner on 28.8.1974 and that order was not questioned by anybody. After a lapse of about 17 years and two months, the 4th respondent i.e. Project

Director I.T.D.A., Rampachodavaram, preferred an appeal along with a petition to condone the delay, and the appellate authority i.e. the 2nd respondent-District Collector entertained the appeal and passed an order dated 25.3.1995 cancelling the assignment made in favour of the petitioner. The said order is behind the back of the petitioner, who was not served with any notice about the appeal preferred by the 4th respondent. Against the order of the 2nd respondent, though the petitioner preferred a Second Appeal, the 1st respondent-Commissioner, Survey Settlements and Land Records, dismissed it confirming the orders passed by the 2nd respondent. First of all, this Court is of the view that the 2nd respondent-District Collector ought to not to have entertained the appeal preferred by the 4th respondent as it was preferred after a lapse of about 17 years and two months. Even if it is accepted that the 2nd respondent can entertain an appeal, the minimum requirement is that before passing any order adverse to the interest of the petitioner, he should have issued a notice calling upon the petitioner to show cause as to how she is entitled to a ryothwari patta so that she would have been in a position to explain about her entitlement to the ryothwari patta granted by the 3rd respondent-Settlement Officer. Hence, this Court is of the view that the orders passed by the 1st respondent confirming the order of the 1st respondent is liable to be set aside.

In the result, the writ petition is allowed setting aside the order, dated 15.10.1997 passed by the 1st respondent. However, the 2nd respondent is hereby directed to issue a Show Cause Notice to the petitioner calling for her explanation, and after considering the objections if any raised by her, decide the appeal preferred by the 4th respondent. Having regard to the fact that this is an old matter of the year 1997, the 2nd respondent is hereby directed to dispose of the

appeal expeditiously, and in any case, not later than six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

_____

23.02.2007

bcj